



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,915	10/27/2000	James R. Tranchina	8002A-24	8365
22150	7590	01/12/2006	EXAMINER	
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			VU, NGOC K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/698,915

Applicant(s)

TRANCHINA, JAMES R.

Examiner

Ngoc K. Vu

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 and 7-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 11, 14-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pala et al. (US 6,304,173 A) in view of Wugofski et al. (US 6,553,567 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Pala teaches a console for a vehicle (see figure 1), comprising:

an assembly housing (34) adapted to mount against an interior surface of the vehicle; a receiver (84), houseable in said assembly, adapted to receive signals from at least one video input source (i.e., TV, DVD/VCR or game); a display device (24), houseable in said assembly and operatively coupled to said receiver, adapted to reproduce the signals; a processor (within 84) adapted to execute applications (i.e., positioning information for control movement of the display device) associated with said console; and an operating system (within 84) adapted to manage the applications associated with said console (see figures 1-2; col. 3, lines 10-16, 23-29, 36-45; col. 5, lines 4-9). Pala does not teach receiving wireless signal from the video source via a wireless receiver. However, Wugofski teaches receiving signals wirelessly via a wireless receiver 114-118 from video input source 102-106 as shown in figure 1

Art Unit: 2611

(see figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Pala by receiving wireless signals from video input source via a wireless receiver as taught by Wugofski in order to eliminate wires or lines around the passengers and driver within the vehicle.

Regarding claim 2, Pala as modified by Wugofski further teaches that the wireless signals are radio frequency (see Wugofski: col. 3, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 3, the combination teaching of Pala and Wugofski teaches that the input source from video disk player or VCR includes circuitry for producing video signals and the input source comprises a wireless transmitter (106 – see figure 1) for transmitting the wireless signals (see Pala: figure 1; Wugofski: figure 1 and col. 2, lines 60-62).

Regarding claim 11, the combined teaching of Pala and Wugofski further includes signal processing facilities (within receiver) adapted to perform signal processing with respect to the wireless signals (see Wugofski: figure 1).

Regarding claim 14, Pala as modified by Wugofski further teaches a wireless transmitter (106) (see Wugofski: figure 1).

Regarding claim 15, Pala further teaches that display device 24 is mounted in either at position 24a or 24b (see figure 1).

Regarding claims 16 and 17, Pala teaches that the display device comprises a liquid crystal display (LCD) (see Pala: col. 2, lines 12-16).

Regarding claim 18, Pala does not specifically disclose that the display device employs touch screen technology. Official Notice is taken that touch screen technology is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the display device of Pala by using touch screen technology in order to allow the user to control display device in a convenient manner.

Regarding claim 19, Pala as modified by Wugofski teaches wireless receiver is disposed within the display device (see Wugofski: figure 2).

Regarding claim 20, Pala as modified by Wugofski teaches that the wireless receiver is disposed external to the display device (see Wugofski: figure 1).

Regarding claim 21, Pala as modified by Wugofski further teaches that the wireless signals comprise audio/video (see Wugofski: col. 2, lines 60-65).

Regarding claim 22, Pala as modified by Wugofski further teaches that the wireless receiver (114-118) comprises an antenna (114 - see Wugofski: figure 1).

Regarding claim 23, Pala as modified by Wugofski further teaches that the wireless transmitter (106) comprises an antenna (see Wugofski: figure 1).

Regarding claim 24, Pala shows that the assembly housing is adapted to mount against a roof of the vehicle (see Pala: figure 1).

Regarding claim 26, Pala teaches that a console for a vehicle (see figure 1), comprising: an assembly housing (34) adapted to mount against an interior surface of the vehicle; a receiver (84), houseable in said assembly, adapted to receive signals from at least one input source (i.e., TV, DVD/VCR or auto PC); a display device (24), houseable in said assembly and operatively coupled to said receiver, adapted to reproduce the signals (see figures 1-2; col. 3, lines 10-16, 23-29; col. 5, lines 4-9). Pala fails to teach a wireless transceiver adapted to send and receive the wireless signals from the input source and the input source is part of a network external to the vehicle. However, Wugofski teaches that a system comprises a wireless receiver 118 receives wireless signals from video input source and further comprises a wireless transmitter 148 to transmit signals to other device (see figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Pala by receiving wireless signals from external video input source via a wireless receiver and transmitting signals to other device via a

Art Unit: 2611

wireless transmitter as taught by Wugofski in order to eliminate wires or lines around the passengers and driver within the vehicle.

4. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pala et al. (US 6,304,173 A) in view of Wugofski et al. (US 6,553,567 B1) and further in view of Obradovich (US 6,577,928 B2).

Regarding claims 4 and 9, the combination of Pala and Wugofski fails to teach that the console further comprise a wireless joystick or mouse detachable from the console. However, Obradovich teaches using a wireless joystick or mouse as an indicator device to point and click on a displayed option or object on screen to select and activate (see col. 22, lines 4-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined system of Pala and Wugofski by using a wireless joystick or mouse as taught by Obradovich in order to provide user interface to enhance a user's ability to interact with the system wirelessly.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pala et al. (US 6,304,173 A) in view of Wugofski et al. (US 6,553,567 B1) and further in view of Holloway et al. (US 6,256,317).

Regarding claim 5, Pala and Wugofski fail to teach the wireless signals are transmitted through one of a packet-switched wireless network and a circuit-switched wireless network. However, Holloway teaches that a packet-switched network wherein wireless signals are utilized to transmit data between stations for the benefit of providing a multiple access network with improved performance, collision resolution, and multiple priority levels of access (see figure 1; col. 4, lines 12-44; figure 4; col. 6-7, lines 66-6; col. 4, lines 12-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined system of Pala and Wugofski to incorporate the wireless signals are transmitted through a packet-switched wireless network as taught by Holloway in order to provide a multiple

Art Unit: 2611

access network with improved performance, collision resolution, and multiple priority levels of access in a video distribution system.

6. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pala et al. (US 6,304,173 A) in view of Wugofski et al. (US 6,553,567 B1) and further in view of Treyz (US 6,526,335).

Regarding claim 27, Pala teaches that a console for a vehicle (see figure 1), comprising: an assembly housing (34) adapted to mount against an interior surface of the vehicle; a receiver (84), houseable in said assembly, adapted to receive signals from at least one input source (i.e., TV, DVD/VCR or auto PC); a display device (24), houseable in said assembly and operatively coupled to said receiver, adapted to reproduce the signals (see figures 1-2; col. 3, lines 10-16, 23-29; col. 5, lines 4-9). Pala does not teach receiving wireless signal from the video source via a wireless receiver. However, Wugofski teaches receiving signals wirelessly via a wireless receiver 114-118 from video input source 102-106 as shown in figure 1 (see figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Pala by receiving wireless signals from video input source via a wireless receiver as taught by Wugofski in order to eliminate wires or lines around the passengers and driver within the vehicle.

Pala also fails to teach a wireless transmitter, adapted to transmit wireless control signals to a wireless receiver for configuring controls. However, Treyz teaches a wireless transmitter, i.e., remote control, which transmits wireless control signals to a wireless receiver in an automobile computer system, wherein the wireless control signals are utilized to configure control settings such as tuning to radio stations, changing volume (see figure 18, col. 19, lines 46-50; col. 23, line 66 to col. 24, line 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined system of Pala and Wugofski by including a

Art Unit: 2611

wireless transmitter adapted to transmit wireless control signals to a wireless receiver as taught by Treyz in order to allow occupants to control various functions of device in vehicle without requiring the occupants to physically interact the device itself.

Regarding claim 28, the combinations of Pala and Wugofski further in view of Treyz fail to teach that wireless transmitter is adapted to be detachable from the console. Official Notice is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing vehicle consoles with detachable controllers (i.e., wireless transmitters) are well known in the art. Consoles with detachable controllers are well known in vehicles, wherein devices utilized with the console are attached to the console when not in use and are further detachable, so that a passenger may utilize the device and return the device to the console for storage to prevent loss or damage to the device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined system of Pala and Wugofski further in view of Treyz to incorporate the wireless transmitter is detachable from the console so that a passenger may utilize the device and return the device to the console for storage to prevent loss or damage to the device.

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Pala and Wugofski as modified by Treyz further teaches that the wireless transmitter, i.e., remote control, for operating an automobile personal computer system. A wireless remote control which outputs control signals in response to user selection of commands inherently discloses a processor and associated memory for executing and storing programs because the remote control is necessarily executing programs which are stored on the remote control, which also necessarily requires a processor to execute for programs, wherein the remote control receives an input, associates the input with a corresponding command, and subsequently generates the particular command signal to be transmitted to the receiving device.



7. Claims 7, 8, 10, 13, 25 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pala et al. (US 6,304,173 A) in view of Wugofski et al. (US 6,553,567 B1) and further in view of DeLine et al. (US 6,420,975 B1).

Regarding claims 7-8, Pala does not teach the system further comprising a web browser to interact with one of the Internet and the World Wide Web using wireless application protocol. However, DeLine teaches processing system in a vehicle comprises Internet service to access world wide web via wireless communication system such as Bluetooth (see col. 27, lines 20-30; col. 40, lines 14-21 and lines 65-67; col. 43-44, lines 66-3 and figure 16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Pala including Internet service to access world wide web via wireless communication system as taught by DeLine in order to effectively enhance the entertainment system in the vehicle.

Regarding claim 10, Pala does not teach the system further comprising a voice recognition system. However, DeLine teaches a voice recognition system in a vehicle. For example, once speech from a vehicle-based occupant is recognized, the processing system can turn down or off the volume of radio/music player in the vehicle for the period that the vehicle-based speaker is talking (see col. 33, lines 57-62; col. 44, lines 3-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Pala by using a voice recognition system as taught by DeLine in order to allow a vehicle occupant to control the radio/music player in a convenient manner.

Regarding claims 13 and 30, Pala does not teach a vehicle occupant sends media to the console for display via a wireless signal from a personal digital assistant or a smart phone. However, DeLine teaches an apparatus comprises a personal communication device such as a PALM organizer which conveys information to the vehicle occupants of the vehicle. The

Art Unit: 2611

apparatus further provides wireless transmission protocol such as Bluetooth (see col. 27, lines 48-57; col. 40, line 65 to col. 41, line 22; col. 35, line 52 to col. 36, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Pala by providing information from a personal communication device or from a wireless transmitter using Bluetooth protocol as taught by DeLine in order to provide signals wirelessly with low-cost.

Regarding claim 25, Pala teaches that a console for a vehicle (see figure 1), comprising: an assembly housing (34) adapted to mount against an interior surface of the vehicle; a receiver (84), houseable in said assembly, adapted to receive signals from at least one video input source (i.e., TV, DVD/VCR or auto PC); a display device (24), houseable in said assembly and operatively coupled to said receiver, adapted to reproduce the signals (see figures 1-2; col. 3, lines 10-16, 23-29; col. 5, lines 4-9).

Pala does not teach receiving wireless signal from the video source via a wireless receiver. However, Wugofski teaches receiving signals wirelessly via a wireless receiver 114-118 from video input source 102-106 as shown in figure 1 (see figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Pala by receiving wireless signals from video input source via a wireless receiver as taught by Wugofski in order to eliminate wires or lines around the passengers and driver within the vehicle.

Pala does not teach the system further comprising a web browser to interact with one of the Internet and the World Wide Web. However, DeLine teaches processing system in a vehicle comprises Internet service to access world wide web (see col. 27, lines 20-30; col. 40, lines 14-21 and lines 65-67; col. 43-44, lines 66-3 and figure 16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Pala

including Internet service to access world wide web as taught by DeLine in order to effectively enhance the entertainment system in the vehicle.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pala et al. (US 6,304,173 A) in view of Wugofski et al. (US 6,553,567 B1) and further in view of Caci (US 6,154,658 A).

Regarding claim 12, Pala does not teach a text-to-speech system. However, Caci teaches a text-to-speech converter which performs the desired conversion from text data to synthetic speech. The synthetic speech signals then are processed and provided to speakers (see col. 10, lines 50-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Pala by including a text-to-speech system to convert text data into synthetic voice as taught by Caci in to order to provide safety for vehicle operator.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoc K. Vu whose telephone number is 571-272-7306. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ngoc K. Vu', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ngoc K. Vu  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2611

January 9, 2006